

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/21/what_to_do_about_pakistan?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full

[What to Do About Pakistan](#)

With an "ally" in a state of perpetual dysfunction, it's time for Washington to reconsider its options: containment or benign neglect.

BY C. CHRISTINE FAIR | JUNE 21, 2012



The last year and a half has been a rocky road for U.S.-Pakistan relations -- and once again, domestic and foreign policy developments seem ever more perilous. The year 2011 opened with the cold-blooded assassination of the governor of Punjab, Salman Taseer, by a fanatic who denounced him as a blasphemer. Americans watched aghast as Pakistan's elite failed to defend Taseer, while many Pakistanis praised the assassin. Shortly thereafter, U.S.-Pakistan relations convulsed when two ISI ruffians confronted a CIA contractor, Raymond Davis. Davis shot the men dead. No sooner had the two "allies" managed to weather that crisis than the United States conducted a unilateral raid to kill Osama bin Laden, who was ensconced in the cantonment town of Abbottabad, near Pakistan's acclaimed military academy. Before relations could thaw, an accidental raid on Pakistani troops at the Salala checkpoint in November killed 24. The United

States steadfastly refused to apologize publicly. Pakistan retaliated by shutting down all ground supply routes into Afghanistan. And this is where we find ourselves today.

As Americans confront an increasingly contracting set of options to engage Pakistan, Islamabad has offered yet another twist to the ongoing policy dilemma in Washington. Just this week, Pakistan's erratic and ever-activist Supreme Court ruled that Yousaf Raza Gilani is no longer qualified to remain prime minister. Then on Thursday, another court issued an arrest warrant for Makhdoom Shahabuddin, who was President Asif Ali Zardari's first choice to replace the ousted Gilani. And just for good measure, the court also issued a warrant for Gilani's son. If Pakistan's civilian government wasn't fully dysfunctional, rest assured: it now is. Unfortunately, ensuring the stability of this civilian government has been a policy goal of the United States since the return to democracy in February 2008.

By any measure, Pakistan has squandered the last decade. The events of 9/11 afforded the country a rare opportunity to regain its international standing after having teetered for years on the brink of pariah state status. Pakistan had become renowned for spreading nuclear technology to such states as Iran and North Korea; reckless adventurism in India; insistence on supporting jihadist groups as a principal tool of statecraft; and steadfast refusal to adopt policies that might invest in its people rather than entrench the military's deep state. Had Pakistan chosen to jettison its jihad habit, sought assistance in rehabilitating tens of thousands of militants and their supporters in Pakistan, and found some amicable resolution to its longstanding dispute with India, it would still enjoy the support of the West, as well as their collective checkbooks, today.

Those years have gone. Pakistan is in crisis. Its courts act on whim rather than jurisprudence. Its political parties are vast pools of corrupt patronage networks that aggregate elite interests while disregarding the interests of Pakistan's struggling masses. Neither elected politicians nor military rulers have had the political courage to right the nation's fiscal woes by enforcing income tax or imposing industrial and agricultural taxes on the ruling elites and their networks of influence. While the army has retrenched from a direct role in politics, it has done so likely because it has no other option: Pakistan's military suffered a mighty humiliation after the bin Laden raid, which left many citizens wondering whether their country is a failed state, a rogue state, or both.

Not surprisingly, the United States is frustrated. Many in the Washington have told me that "we are 'this close' to bombing them," yet the Pakistanis continue to somnambulate in the dream of their country's own importance. U.S. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta may have jolted some out of their slumber with his recent comments in Delhi and Kabul. Not only did he say in clarion words that Washington is exhausted with Pakistan's various ruses, but he also addressed forthrightly the simple fact that Pakistan has taken billions of U.S. dollars to assist the war on terrorism while continuing to support the very elements killing our troops. In case Pakistan missed the reference, Panetta made clear that "anybody who attacks U.S. soldiers is our enemy. We are not going to take it."

Ironically, 11 years later Pakistan seems a whole lot more dangerous than it was on Sept. 10, 2001. Elements of Pakistan's erstwhile jihadi proxies (notably Jaish-e-Mohammed and Harkat-ul-Jihad-e-Islami, among others) have refocused their efforts to sustain a bloody war on Pakistan itself. These groups have long targeted Pakistan's Ahmadiyya, Shia, Christian, and Hindu

minorities. In recent years, they have turned their guns, grenades, and suicide vests against the majority of Pakistanis: Sufis who worship at shrines. Not only have many Pakistanis blamed "outside" elements for these crimes, but many have also even rallied about these killers. Most notably, the killer of Salman Taseer was garlanded by supporters. The judge who sentenced Taseer's killer -- who proudly confessed his guilt -- had to flee the country after receiving death threats. Such disturbing mobilization should give pause to those who champion the causes of the "silent moderate majority" in Pakistan.

Equally disconcerting, Pakistan has long refused international access to its chief nuclear black marketer, Abdul Qadeer Khan. Worse, the state and its citizenry have paraded him about the country like a super hero the nation desperately wants. Pakistan has a Nobel laureate (Abdus Salam, Physics, 1979), but he is not embraced because he is a member of the much-loathed minority Ahmadiyya community. Pakistan understands full well that it is these nuclear fears that ensure that the United States will not easily walk away from Pakistan. In recent years, Pakistan has focused its resources on fissile material production and the assembly of tactical nuclear weapons -- including nuclear artillery. Pakistan sees its nuclear program as its insurance against a catastrophic showdown with the United States.

Despite Washington's increasing demands that Pakistan disassemble its terrorism infrastructure, Islamabad has consistently chosen the most unproductive paths. Rather than shutting down the various Islamist terror groups operating from Pakistan's soil with varying degrees of explicit and implicit state support, it has pushed jihadi leaders such as Lashkar-e-Taiba to the forefront of the recent political gathering of rogues, the Difa-e-Pakistan Council (DPC or "Defense of Pakistan Council"). The DPC is festooned with jihadi leaders, as well as former military and intelligence personas known as jihadi apologists. The DPC, of course, is then used by the military and intelligence agencies as a foil to efforts by the political parties to renormalize relations with the United States and seek political and economic rapprochement with India.

Those in Washington who steadfastly believed that, with enough patience and assistance, Pakistan could slowly be transformed into a responsible partner for some modicum of stability in South Asia have been chagrined by a sorry trail of persistent perfidy.

Even those who believe that the intelligence, military, and/or political leadership had no knowledge of bin Laden's sprawling den in Abbottabad near Pakistan's Military Academy, cannot help but be dismayed by the choices the country has made since his death in May 2011. While Pakistan's arrest of the physician [Dr. Shakil Afridi](#), who helped identify and eliminate bin Laden for the time-tested crime of espionage, what is abhorrent is that he is the only one who has been arrested.

Even if one accepts (for the purpose of argument) that Afridi committed espionage, what explains the lack of any investigation, much less prosecution, of the landlord of bin Laden's compound? Why has there been no investigation into who actually facilitated his sanctuary in Pakistan and his extensive travels with his terror entourage? Who are the various physicians that attended to the deliveries of his numerous children, birthed by his numerous wives with him in the compound? Pakistan has made it crystal clear that it has no interest in identifying -- much less punishing -- those who aided and abetted bin Laden.

Recently, the Pakistani Taliban have ceased polio vaccinations until the U.S. drone program is called off. Of course, the reality is that many of Pakistan's ostensible clergy have long denounced such vaccinations as a Western plot to reduce Muslim fecundity. Thus, it is not clear what the marginal impact of this recent chicanery will be on Pakistan's polio crisis. Pakistan is one of the few countries on the planet with [endemic polio infections](#).

At long last, it seems, various agencies of the United States government have come to the conclusion that Pakistan cannot be changed. Islamabad's behavior in the region will remain staunchly pegged to its antipathy toward New Delhi. It will pursue policies that threaten the integrity of the Pakistani state for no other reason but the chimerical objective of resisting the obvious rise of India, while clinging to the delusion that it is India's peer competitor -- despite obvious and ever-growing disparities.

Finally, Americans are asking what Pakistanis have long concluded: How can the United States and Pakistan have any kind of positive relationship when our strategic interests not only diverge but violently clash?

* * *

For once there's consensus in Washington. Currently, the U.S. Department of Defense, Central Intelligence Agency, vast swathes of the State Department, both houses of the Congress, and the White House have all joined in chorus to decry Pakistan's duplicity. While acknowledging Pakistan's dangerous policies and their implications, and holding Pakistan to account for the same, the United States needs to resist the most basal urges simply to "cut off" Pakistan. Such a move would ultimately be counterproductive.

The United States should continue to engage Pakistan where possible. The United States has no doubt learned that there is little it can do to bolster domestic stability in Pakistan. As the most recent governance crisis unfolds, there are few in Washington who harbor any belief that the United States can still help transform Pakistan. There is an increasing acknowledgement that the United States must engage the Pakistan that *is* rather than the Pakistan that is desired.

This means that embassies and consulates should continue to function without retrenchment. Pakistan cannot be left alone to become an Iran or North Korea -- which remain opaque to U.S. diplomatic, military, and intelligence agencies. Military exchanges should continue, as should security training missions, as long as there is Pakistani demand for the same. The United States should continue some degree of human development with modest rather than transformative goals. The United States should deepen educational ties, especially with younger cohorts of Pakistanis who face a dismal future in economically shambolic Pakistan.

However, future strategic assistance, such as the sale of F-16 fighter jets, would be misguided. After all, the founding logic of "strategic military sales" is beguiled by the simple fact that our strategic aims clash. Rather than pursuing some fantasy of a "strategic relations," these forms of assistance should be transactional and contingent on actual -- rather than hoped for -- performance. The United States should be willing to provide weapons systems and training that

enhance Pakistan's capabilities to contend with its internal security crises rather than those that encourage it to resist the inevitable military dominance of India.

While the United States -- amid political outrage at Pakistan's ongoing perfidy and deepening fiscal austerity -- should continue to engage Pakistan where possible, there are larger issues Washington must confront now. If it cannot persuade Pakistan to abandon the most noxious policies of jihad and nuclear proliferation, then it must quickly embrace the realities of managing those problems in the most effective manner possible.

There are at least two approaches that should be considered -- neither of which negates the fundamental need to remain engaged at whatever level is possible and sustainable. And neither is fundamentally at odds with the other.

The first notion that is gaining momentum is the notion of containment. Proponents of some version of containment debate the contents and lineaments of this policy. If containing the *country* is not possible, containing the *threat* may be more feasible. This includes increasing pressure on Pakistani intelligence, military, and other personalities for which there is intelligence showing they enable nuclear proliferation or terrorism. It is important to sanction specific persons rather than agencies generally. Such pressure could include visa denial (which the Pakistanis routinely do to their foes and critics), working with international entities to restrict finances outside of the country, or working with Interpol to have them arrested when they leave Pakistan.

A second -- and indeed complimentary -- strategic option is for the United States to withdraw itself as an arbiter in the region and hold Pakistan fully responsible for acts of omission and commission tied to its twinned policy of nuclear proliferation and jihad. This may be best described as "benign neglect."

A policy of benign neglect could undermine the two pillars of Pakistan's nuclear jihad strategy. First, by increasing fissile materials and expanding tactical nuclear weapon production, Pakistan aims to increase the possible cost to India for any punitive action. Second, it seeks to pull in the United States to restrain India from action. These two facets taken together reduce any cost that Pakistan has paid for its nuclear jihad strategy. The United States should clearly tell Islamabad -- publicly and privately -- that it has no intention of playing this mediating role in the future. In any event, the U.S. record in solving the Indo-Pakistan dispute is abysmal at best and humiliating at worst. Making clear that Washington will no longer even attempt to try to play this role will dramatically force Pakistan to rethink the cost-benefit calculus of using militant groups such as Lashkar-e-Taiba as instruments of foreign policy.

The United States should also consider the value of a simple statement of the obvious: For all intents and purposes, the contested Line of Control that divides Indian- and Pakistan-administered portions of Kashmir is the border. In doing so, Washington would make clear to Pakistan that Kashmir is an internal affair to be resolved by New Delhi and Srinagar. This position should be reflected in U.S. maps and other official documents, which would deprive the Pakistanis of the ability to credibly claim to have any equities in the "Kashmir issue." While there are genuine governance problems in Indian-administered Kashmir, none of these problems

functionally concern Pakistan. Pakistan's militant groups and the countermeasures they have induced have plunged the province into an industrial recession that will take decades to recover from. Meanwhile, Kashmiris have paid the price for Pakistan's policies -- while those Pakistanis who oversaw the campaign of jihad enjoy a life of comfort and ease at home.

As a part of the benign neglect approach, the United States also should be willing to consider letting Pakistan fail economically by not coercing the International Monetary Fund to bail out the country unless it meets its own commitments to fiscal reforms. While many Pakistanis will no doubt see this as an unfair punitive measure, it is a near certitude that Islamabad will never make the necessary reforms to expand its tax revenues as long as it can use its inherent instability to extort ongoing assistance from bilateral and multilateral donors and agencies. This is the essence of moral hazard.

Finally, the United States should work to undermine Pakistan's continued effort to use its expanding nuclear program to extract assistance from the international community. Since 9/11, Pakistan has increased fissile material production and expanded its arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons. Meanwhile, Pakistan's vast jihadi landscape further conjures the image of Islamist barbarians banging at the nuclear gate. The United States has spent considerable effort and resources to manage this problem to the best extent possible.

These efforts may well be counterproductive. First, with respect to undesirable proliferation, Pakistan and the United States share incentives. After all, if the jihadis can penetrate the program, so can Indian, U.S., or even Israeli intelligence agencies. Thus, there is a natural incentive for Pakistan to seek and obtain assistance. Still, the United States should actively seek to neutralize Pakistan's susceptibility to allowing nuclear weapons to fall into the hands of dangerous non-state actors. It can do so by devising a declaratory policy that requires Pakistan to behave as the sovereign state it claims to be. Namely, if Pakistani assets are used in a state or non-sponsored incident, Islamabad will be held responsible. Can Islamabad's security managers fault the United States for insisting that it bear the consequences of such much-lauded sovereignty?

While some may view these offerings as unreasonable, reckless, dangerous, and irresponsible, it is equally fair to ask whether Washington's decades of policies toward Pakistan have been unreasonable, dangerous, and irresponsible? Moreover, what good have they accomplished? While many policymakers and analysts are willing to bank everything on the gamble that Pakistan is too dangerous to fail, we should be willing to consider what failure would mean and the inherent costs and benefits of this happening. After all, when the Soviet Union fell, none of the worst fears materialized. And Pakistan is hardly the Soviet Union.

C. Christine Fair is assistant professor in the Peace and Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service.

296 comments



Welcome to Foreign Policy's new commenting system! The good news is that it's now easier than ever to comment and share your insights with friends. Here's how it works: You can now sign in by creating a LiveFyre account (which will replace the ForeignPolicy.com accounts from now on), or using a Twitter or Facebook account, and carry on a conversation with your fellow commenters in the section below. You do not have to sign in using a social network if you choose to remain anonymous – simply use a LiveFyre account to continue commenting. For more information, [click here](#).

[Sign in with Twitter Facebook Livefyre](#)

Powered by **livefyre**

Post comment as
+ Follow conversation

Post to TWITTER FACEBOOK

Sort: [Newest](#) | [Oldest](#)



[mjs](#)

Christine Fair at least live up to your name for your own sake . The belief that USA is capable of successfully implementing any one of the options suggested in the article, must change , study your own very recent history Take off your blinkers and you will see differently. These rascal of Jihadist all types, will not disappear because USA wants them to they will go away in time with patience and resolve by the Pakistani nations USA must stay away FOR ITS OWN GOOD. it must rein its own Jihadist

Ms. Fair DO NOT PROMOTE SUCH FAILED POLICY OPTIONS

8 hours agoReplyLike



[playful](#)

mjs >>they will go away in time with patience and resolve by the Pakistani nations<< They will NOT go away--what pakistani patience and resolve are you talking about? They would go away if Pakistan stopped supporting them! They get their money, weapons, strategic support, training, and communications from Pakistan. You have two decades of failed policies to blame, not the US. The US only got to Afghanistan in 2003 really when they sheltered OBL, whereas they (as your proxies) were creating mayhem for many years before that. Remember, the US came there because of your and their policies were creating havoc in the world. Now that the US is there, having taken the fight right to your backyard, the world is happy because your policies are creating havoc only for you. And the world is just fine.

5 hours agoReplyLike



[NaumanSaeed](#)

Ms. Christine is right about most of the things she had mentioned in her articles... but she must also remember that who made the jihadist stronger and supported them during the Afghan - Soviet war it was USA, they provided the funds and weapons to them to fight against russia, and now after making their roots stronger and deeper they are complaining that we are supporting them. Now the jihadist organizations have the links to get funds and weapons from outside sources because you see I don't think that pakistani government is supporting them because our government is busy in looting for themselves they will never give money to such organizations. And by the way I honestly don't think that we the masses of Pakistan ever choose a government it is always decided by the west and USA that who will govern us. Once in 64 years if they will let us choose the ruler I hope that things would be different in Pakistan. I am still hopeful for the future of Pakistan.....

14 hours agoReplyLike



[playful](#)

NaumanSaeed You are absolutely correct. But it was Pakistan's generals who dreamt of using these jihandist orgs to exert power in Afghanistan and India. It wasn't the US. In fact it was clear from the beginning of the Afghan war that while the US wanted to defeat the Soviets, your war was with India. The rest was a side show for your army, as it has been in the last eight years as well. Your own agencies think nothing of sacrificing your own people in this cynical pursuit of "national interest", which then leads to the rest of the world thinking that too. The US has been your biggest benefactor and supporter in every forum of the world. It has given you weapons and money, keeping your country afloat. Your feeling of betrayal is engineered by agencies and their media plants because the US does not want to encourage you to fight with India either by hook or by crook. And they can't stand it. There's much to be hopeful in Pakistan. But not as long as the country's strategic orientation is geared towards an eternal confrontation and parity with India. That changes, and instantly Pakistan can be at peace with itself, and there can be peace in Afghanistan.

13 hours ago Reply Like



[ChuckMartin](#)

Ahmad Bilal says: "I think there's dangerous hubris in the Indian mindset as well... The East Pakistan victory happened because 3 divisions of Pakistan army fought 13 divisions of the Indian army... 1 air base with 6 sabre aircraft vs 6 airbases doing 200 sorties a day... Even then you were fighting a depleted army which had not recovered from the 1965 sanctions... We weren't a weapons producer back then..."

Do you think war is a football match where opponents need to be equal in number? A country will commit as many troops in a war as it thinks is necessary to win the war. You don't try to win brownie points in a war; you try to win THE war.

14 hours ago Reply Like



[GhulamMohammed](#)

Ms Fair sells Pakistan short on the Kashmir issue, just as American foreign policy sells Palestinians short on their losses. Americans want Pakistanis to accept all American priorities in the region without showing the slightest sensitivity to Pakistan's priorities.

1 day ago Reply Like



[AhmadBilal](#)

GhulamMohammed

The US was and will always remain its own friend... Right now it chooses to see China as a threat and wants to prop up India as a counter to China... Tomorrow India would be the threat and the US will abruptly remember the abuses carried out by Shiv Sena / Bajrang Dal

1 day ago Reply Like



[playful](#)

AhmadBilal GhulamMohammed hahahaha, yeah... Shiv Sena bombing the US, riiiiight.

22 hours ago Reply Like



[al_beruni](#)

AhmadBilal GhulamMohammed That's right, you have hit the nail on the head. The answer to Pakistan's problems is to point out that there are some problems in India. Congratulations! That's a great job and very well done.

22 hours ago Reply Like



[Aprenous](#)

AhmadBilalGhulamMohammed

AhmadBilal

GhulamMohammed

>>"The US was and will always remain its own friend..."<<

That is just about the only cogent thing you have said on this thread or any other. Yes, countries tend to do things best for themselves. They are their own "best friends."

Who are Pakistan's "friends"? Not too many out there that list Pakistan as even an ally.

>>"Right now it chooses to see China as a threat and wants to prop up India as a counter to China... Tomorrow India would be the threat and the US will abruptly remember the abuses carried out by Shiv Sena / Bajrang Dal" <<

That is simply nonsense! America and China are BIG trading partners; ditto for India and much of the rest of the world. Everyone buys American/Western goods especially food and technology. Everyone who has money buys American/Western luxury goods.

What does Pakistan produce and export to the world aside from a few, poor quality textiles?

The U. S. sees States like Pakistan as enemies—whether officially acknowledged or not—because they sponsor terror and feed at the world trough.

Why Pakistan and other Muslim nations cannot get their act together and produce instead of take, why they cannot export positive things instead of negative Islamic supremacism is the question of the age.

22 hours ago Reply Like



[playful](#)

GhulamMohammed What are Pakistan's priorities?

22 hours ago Reply Like



[Aprenous](#)

playful GhulamMohammed I was going to ask him the same thing. :)

It certainly is not development, education, civil society, the rule of law, modernization or infrastructure.

22 hours agoReplyLike



[Ghulam Mohammed](#)

Playful, Pakistan's priority for the past 65 years has been a just solution to the Kashmir problem.

14 hours agoReplyLike



[playful](#)

Ghulam Mohammed Why?

13 hours agoReplyLike



[Aprenous](#)

Ghulam Mohammed What a "useful" priority for a failed nation.

7 hours agoReplyLike



[al_beruni](#)

This is a pretty good article. My only complaint is that ignores US policy from 1940-1990 wherein it happily supported Pakistan and its generals. That's 50 years of supporting military rule and ultimately Islamism!! We also continue to be best friends with Saudi Arabia. So naturally the Pakistani army believes its essential to US strategic aims. As you well know, the only way to change the entrenched viewpoint of an elite class that also controls an entire country is by its complete defeat. The only question here is whether the model should be that of the cold war or something more aggressive and confrontational. Here are some excellent analyses from distinguished Indian commentators:

www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/article3566434.ece

1 day agoReplyLike



[Aprenous](#)

[al_beruni](#)

As the Arab saying goes:

"The enemy of my enemy is my friend."

Every nation does what is best for its OWN interests in a given time period—every nation that is except the Islamic ones. They tend to shoot themselves in the foot and cut their noses off (and those of their women) to spite their faces for the sake of Allah.

Go figure.

1 day ago Reply Like



[bettbatt](#)

Aprenous .

You American southerners are descendant of borderland thugs and the Scots-Irish savages who have never had civilization, science or culture. You claim the achievements of all European people as your own, but in fact you are merely parasites that live on the achievements of others. You are ignorant and hateful of the world beyond your little towns and hate all new lamen' with a passion. Your religion is a bunch of ignorant and out of context speculation about a series of satanic visions suffered by a weak minded and delusional monk named John of Patmos. Your Bible was composed by a homosexual king for political purposes and contains purposeful misinterpretations in support of monarchy and being slavishly devoted to the super rich. No wonder your theology changes every few years in support of whatever faction is currently in power.

22 hours ago Reply Like



[playful](#)

bettbatt careful about throwing religious stones at others dude. Quite a bot of the same whacko stuff exists in your own texts as well...

22 hours ago Reply Like



[Aprenous](#)

bettbatt

bettbatt

Aprenous .

You American southerners are descendant of borderland thugs and the Scots-Irish savages who have never had civilization, science or culture. You claim the achievements of all European people as your own, but in fact you are merely parasites that live on the achievements of others. You are ignorant and hateful of the world beyond your little towns and hate all new lamen' with a passion. Your religion is a bunch of ignorant and out of context speculation about a series of satanic visions suffered by a weak minded and delusional monk named John of Patmos. Your Bible was composed by a homosexual king for political purposes and contains purposeful misinterpretations in support of monarchy and being slavishly devoted to the super rich. No wonder your theology changes every few years in support of whatever faction is currently in power.' <<

Um, sorry to disappoint you, dude, I am not an American southerner. However, I do know many American Southerners and they are nothing like those you describe above. No American Southerners are going about the world bombing houses of worship, markets and schools. Not too many are abusing their women in the manner that Muslims abuse them by cutting off their noses and ears, throwing acid into their faces, keeping them from being educated and in general using women as sex-slaves to pop-out more little jihadis.

Evidently you have never been to the American South, which is a famous region rich in culture, history, and traditions that and has great food and fantastic music appreciated all over the world. The south also has great cities that are clean and safe for women or anyone to walk down the streets—although the climate in summer leaves a lot to be desired.

Oh, and those Scotch-Irish have a glorious history. Those people also contributed a great deal to not only the U. S. but the world.

All people living today are beneficiaries of WESTERN culture and science. Muslims benefit a great deal since they have contributed little to nothing.

Since Muhammad based the Qur'an on the Bible one has to wonder about your statements. Who was this "homosexual king" who worshiped monarchy and the super rich?

Islam's theology ought to change and move with the times. Since it has not, this is the reason Muslims are still living like savages in the 7th century.

Your choice—Nobody cares! If Muslims would only stop demanding aid from those cultures that have changed with the times.

22 hours ago Reply Like



[CharleyS](#)

Very nice, well reasoned article. There are some new nuggets on current US policy thinking evolution here that I was not aware of. Christine Fair's change of heart on Pakistan is welcome and long overdue. I remember her from showing off her Urdu language skills and knowledge of local info from her visits there, she would reflexively try to protect Pakistan from criticism. I guess it is only so many US troop deaths in the hands of Pakistani troop trained and armed Taliban that she can take. Good for her, and for our troops, God bless them.

2 days ago Reply Like



[AhmadBilal](#)

CharleyS

Charley; the afghans have been at war for 30 years...

You think they need training from us? Even their kids know how to shoot correctly... Theres a link somewhere down in the comments section where I've posted Patreaus's counter insurgency manual...

Go through that to know why you're getting a tough time in Afghanistan... This is not me writing... This is your general...

2 days ago Reply Like



[Aprenous](#)

AhmadBilalCharleyS

AhmadBilal says:

>>"Charley; the afghans have been at war for 30 years..."

You think they need training from us? Even their kids know how to shoot correctly... Theres a link somewhere down in the comments section where I've posted Patreaus's counter insurgency manual...

Go through that to know why you're getting a tough time in Afghanistan... This is not me writing... This is your general... "<<

This is some of the stupidest, most ill-informed, ignorant nonsense that you have written to date, AB-Pakiboy.

The biggest problem that the Afghans have is that their illiterate populace cannot shoot straight. They cannot understand the instructions for modern weaponry or how to put together a disciplined police force and army to keep the peace and protect people from terrorists.

They work for the U. S. during the week and the Taliban on the weekends. They cannot be trusted to protect their own people.

>>"Illiterate, Corrupt and Trigger-Happy

German Trainers Describe Pitiful State of Afghan Police

A functioning police force is seen as a prerequisite for a Western withdrawal from Afghanistan. German trainers, however, paint a disastrous picture of the quality of Afghan security forces. Too many police, they say, can't read or write, can't shoot straight or take bribes...<<<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,687416,00.html>

>>... "Both in his longer report and in an article for Armed Forces Journal published online on February 5, Davis recounts his experience at an Afghan National Police station in Kunar province in January 2011. Arriving two hours after a Taliban attack on the station, Davis asked the police captain whether he had sent out patrols to find the insurgents.

After the question had been conveyed by the interpreter, Davis recalls, "The captain's head wheeled around, looking first at the interpreter and turning to me with an incredulous expression. Then he laughed."

"No! We don't go after them," he quotes the captain as saying. "That would be dangerous!"

According to Davis, US troops who work with Afghan policemen in that province say they "rarely leave the cover of the checkpoints", allowing the Taliban to "literally run free". . .<<http://www.atimes.com/atimes/south_asia/nb14df02.html

2 days ago Reply Like



[Ahmad Bilal](#)

CharleyS

Pasting text from another article.....

You will also notice a lot of Angry Pakistanis on various topics...

Think about the situation from their point of view...

You advise the US not to follow a course in Afghanistan since it will lead to failure... The US does not take that advice... Follows through and finds itself in the same place as the russians (Who had more troops on the ground; had killed a lot more and had the added advantage of having a land border with Afghanistan)

The entire mess means the US controls roughly 25% of Afghanistan; the rest is all bandit country...

Internally Patreaus's counter insurgency manual, the US needs 20-25 soldiers for every 1000 civilians.

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/army/fm3-24fd.pdf>

Please see Page 25 and I quote.

"Most density recommendations fall within a range of 20 to 25 counterinsurgents for every 1000 residents in an AO. Twenty counterinsurgents per 1000 residents is often considered the minimum troop density required for effective COIN operations"

Afghanistan has a population of 28 million people. This means that at a MINIMUM, the US needs to deploy 560,000 troops and for EFFECTIVE counter insurgency at least 700,000 troops are needed. The COIN manual is made for an urban area like Iraq where population centers are cities.

You need a lot more for a place like Afghanistan. In Afghanistan you have thousands and thousands of villages with a population size of 1000-2000. You cant have a base right beside each village. You cant control the population centers which means you dont own squat.

Externally Patreaus and the army cant politically justify what the heck is going on; so lo and behold its blame Pakistan...

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bOR3852MJA>

On the other side; we Pakistanis loose 45,000 fellow countrymen and then get called a collaborator...With that sort of situation, the general Pakistani obviously asks why the %\$&^ they're taking this crap anyway...

2 days ago Reply Like



[playful](#)

AhmadBilal CharleyS Share the source?

2 days ago Reply Like



[AhmadBilal](#)

playful CharleyS

Which argument?

Patreaus's manual is linked.

2 days ago Reply Like



[playful](#)

AhmadBilal CharleyS "pasting from another article"

2 days ago Reply Like



[AhmadBilal](#)

playful CharleyS

Its my own comment which I posted in the

No Country for Armed Men article by Ahmed Rashid

2 days ago Reply Like



[playful](#)

AhmadBilal CharleyS oh. I thought it was from a real article by another writer. My bad.

2 days ago Reply Like



[ChuckMartin](#)

[[Remember that the unit that got OBL knew that there was only a window of 20 minutes to get him before the jig was up...]]

One would have thought that your "world famous" ISI would have known what was happening way before the operation started. Or at least once it was underway. But zilch. We plucked out Osama from right under your noses, less than a couple of miles from your military academy and a couple of hundred miles into Pakistani territory. Where were your military and air force? When India was bombing supply lines inside your territory during the Kargil war, what was your air force doing? You guys have this habit of underestimating your enemies all the time. Usually armies are very cautious about their enemies and often overestimate their enemy's strength in order to compensate for any shortcoming their own army might have.

No wonder you have lost every single war you've fought, except perhaps the ones you waged against your own people.

2 days ago Reply Like



[AhmadBilal](#)

ChuckMartin

I dont think the ISI is ALL that omnipotent... The Indians like to blame it on all things going wrong in their lives... Its funny to see americans sing the same tune...

They dont deserve such praise though...

I'd much rather call them incompetent... See if they had a smidge of sense; the supply routes would have been closed years ago...

Doesnt take a genius to see what the heck is going on...

2 days ago Reply Like



[playful](#)

AhmadBilal ChuckMartin "...Doesnt take a genius to see what the heck is going on..." is right on! :

<http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-South-Central/2011/0531/What-Pakistan-s-ISI-doesn-t-want-the-world-to-know-about-Osama-bin-Laden-s-couriers>

2 days ago Reply Like



[AhmadBilal](#)

playful ChuckMartin

There are thousands of cases of Missing people in Pakistan... Most of these were picked up by the ISI and handed over to the US...

I believe 60% - 80% of the people in Guantanamo were handed over by the ISI...

I dont understand what Saleem Shahzad had to do with OBL??? The link you posted is very hush hush and doesnt really lay anything out other than innuendo...

2 days ago Reply Like



[playful](#)

AhmadBilal ChuckMartin ok then: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/feb/09/pakistan-spy-agency-isi-court>

Your own press frequently reports on people all over your own country being picked up by the ISI and tortured, with people like Najam Sethi and Syed Saim Shehzad actively threatened or eliminated. It's not just the Indians or the Americans who blame the ISI...your own people do too, patriotic ones, and pay with their lives for it.

2 days ago Reply Like



[playful](#)

AhmadBilal ChuckMartin "I believe 60% - 80% of the people in Guantanamo were handed over by the ISI..."

Right on! What were they doing in Pakistan in the first place?

2 days ago Reply Like



[Aprenous](#)

playful AhmadBilal ChuckMartin

playful says:

AhmadBilal ChuckMartin >>"I believe 60% - 80% of the people in Guantanamo were handed over by the ISI..."

Right on! What were they doing in Pakistan in the first place?"<<

These statistics that some people pull out of their hats are really laughable. Most of the prisoners in Guantanamo were Saudis and others from the Gulf as well as Afghanistan and not Pakistanis.

There are thousands of political prisoners in Pakistan caught by none other than Pakistanis.

At its height there were only 775 prisoners in Guantanamo.

Guantanamo as of April 2012, has 169 detainees who remain. They are there because their countries of origin will not take them back and the U. S. does not want them on American soil.

2 days ago Reply Like



AhmadBilal

Aprenous playful ChuckMartin

http://law.shu.edu/publications/quantanamoReports/quantanamo_report_final_2_08_06.pdf

Please see page 2... And I quote "86% of the detainees were arrested by either Pakistan or the Northern Alliance and turned over to United States custody"

1 day agoReplyLike



playful

AhmadBilal Aprenous ChuckMartin You can "...And I quote" all you want. Why are these people in Pakistan to begin with? Is there another country on earth that can claim that they had to arrest this many people and turn over to the US? NO! Why? Because the ISI tried to be too clever by half in its overreach and use these to control Afghanistan and to force India's hand in Kashmir, that's why. These kinds of groups have a nasty habit of coming full 360 and biting the very hand that feeds them, like we see in Pakistan today. And why should the world pay Pakistanis to clean thye detritus of own miscalculations? Oh yeah...because they are a "nuclear power", so its the rest of the world's duty to keep them afloat, like anyone owes them anything. This is enablement of the worst kind.

1 day agoReplyLike



Aprenous

AhmadBilalplayfulChuckMartin

http://law.shu.edu/publications/quantanamoReports/quantanamo_report_final_2_08_06.pdf

Please see page 2... And I quote "86% of the detainees were arrested by either Pakistan or the Northern Alliance and turned over to United States custody"<<

So what!

Most of the prisoners held in Guantanamo were NOT Pakistanis! Most were Arabs.

There is a list of names of these people on the net, since you are so interested.

Man, you must have been sleeping all during class.

Why are you not at work?

1 day ago Reply Like



Ahmad Bilal

playful Chuck Martin

Actually I was a part of the lawyers movement which resulted in the ejection of Musharraf and then the long march movement which led to the reinstatement of the current Chief Justice...

The entire country fought... Waded through tear gas and police batons...

We won against a military dictator and his subservient ISI...

Please see

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MRxMyqJVk8>

In its entirety... The problem today is that the west liked the Pakistan portrayed in the above you tube video... This is the Pakistan which handed over people left right and center...

Its the current Pakistan; that the US has a problem with... This one asks for proof for due process...

1 day ago Reply Like



playful

Ahmad Bilal Chuck Martin Weren't these the same lawyers who then went on to shower flower petals on Salman Taseer's murderer? Was that in favor of or against due process? Which is the one which the west should like or dislike?

1 day ago Reply Like



Ahmad Bilal

playful Chuck Martin

Heck no... The lawyers dont all subscribe to one point of view... I dont know who those people were...

1 day ago Reply Like



Aprenous

Ahmad Bilal playful Chuck Martin

Ahmad Bilal jokes:

>>"Its the current Pakistan; that the US has a problem with... This one asks for proof for due process..."<<

You must be joking, AB-Pakiboy! Pakistan, with its NON due process hudud laws. Where is the due process in Pakistan? WHERE!?

The U. S. has a problem with Pakistan because of its double dealing, its lying and its support of Islamofascist terror as well as—the lack of human rights, especially for women and minorities.

I doubt that you are a lawyer; A clerk maybe.

If you were part of the "lawyers movement" then you are part of the scum-of-the-earth because everyone knows that there is no due process in Pakistan.

1 day agoReplyLike



[AhmadBilal](#)

Aprenous playful ChuckMartin

I already said that I'm not a lawyer... :)

I have read the hudood ordinance...

The Hudood Ordinance itself is un-islamic... This law should be seriously amended...

1 day agoReplyLike



[Aprenous](#)

AhmadBilalplayfulChuckMartin

AhmadBilal

Aprenous playful ChuckMartin

>>"I already said that I'm not a lawyer..."<<

Obviously! I said it too.

Regardless, you seem to have too much time on your hands. Like I said, why are you not working?

>>"I have read the hudood ordinance...

The Hudood Ordinance itself is un-islamic... This law should be seriously amended..."<<

Yeah, sure. Tell that to all the people, especially the women, who have been the victims of the hudud laws.

Oh, if I had another nickel for every time some Muslim claimed this or that was—un-Islamic.

No wonder the umma is so screwed up. Believers cannot even agree on what is Islamic. They have been murdering those with whom they disagree since the days of the Prophet—or should I say Profit. :)

You see, people like you with your lies and delusions is why the whole of humanity is starting to write the Islamic world off. No help for the Syrians, no more aid for other terror sponsoring States. Restricted immigration to the free world and laws made to stop seditious Muslims with their call for discriminatory sharia.

Just hope for some handout from Allah. Surely he will oblige since he loves Muslims the best. :)

23 hours ago Reply Like



AhmadBilal

ChuckMartin

Oh yes; coming to the Kargil issue...

Let me give you some background information to that... The Kargil operation was what the Indians did to Pakistan in Siachin...

Look it up... Musharraf was not exactly a deep thinker... He thought it would not escalate beyond a certain point... PAF chose to not engage the support aircraft, India was sending for its troops in Azad Kashmir... IAF did not cross the international border beyond a certain number of times...

When it did, it lost 2 Migs and a couple of helis (I think) to our shoulder mounted man pads...

2 days agoReplyLike



[playful](#)

AhmadBilal ChuckMartin This is the war where Nawaz sharif begged Bill Clinton for time on July 4th to get the US to intervene as they had done many times before, which they refused. Then Musharraf dashed off to China for help, and they refused too. By this time India has intercepted Musharraf's cell conversation to show that the army was directly involved. All this, when Pakistan had just hosted the Indian PM in Lahore, and peace talks were on. Nothing captures duplicity as clearly as the Kargil war and Osama being captured in Abbottabad. Next will be the Quetta shura, along with Mullah Omar, and Ayman Al Zawahiri. Sit back and enjoy the show.

2 days agoReplyLike



[ChuckMartin](#)

AhmadBilal I read up on the Siachen issue and found that you're probably trying to be a bit clever here. The difference between Siachen and Kargil is that Siachen was unoccupied and there is a difference of interpretation between your two countries with each claiming the glacier for themselves. India simply walked in before you did. On the other hand, border posts were vacated by the Indians during the winter months as per an understanding with your army whereby each army vacated their posts during winter because of harsh climatic conditions. You guys simply took advantage of the Indian absence to take over their posts. While the first case is one of opportunism, the second one is plain betrayal of understanding. Wonder how you can compare the two!

2 days agoReplyLike



[Aprenous](#)

ChuckMartinAhmadBilal

ChuckMartin observes:

>> "...You guys simply took advantage of the Indian absence to take over their posts. While the first case is one of opportunism, the second one is plain betrayal of understanding. Wonder how you can compare the two!..."<<

Because, betrayal of understandings are what Islam is all about. Muslims make agreements with the infidel world when they are weak and break these agreements as they get stronger or bolder.

Look at all the Muslims in the West demanding sharia law and special dispensation for believers after having previously promised to obey Western-secular laws and customs.

Honor and integrity to not come into play for true believers but rather taking advantage does. Thus, using non-Muslim laws against infidels is the name of the game.

2 days agoReplyLike



[AhmadBilal](#)

ChuckMartin

Chuck, I'm not trying to be clever... The status of a line of control is different than an international border... What we have in Kashmir is a cease fire line from 1947 which is called the line of control... It is not an internationally demarcated border...

The Indian siachin thing happened first... The indians didnt setup a commission to negotiate an understanding on where the lines would be... They air dropped soldiers and basically occupied disputed land... Why then cry foul when the same thing happens to them in return?

1 day agoReplyLike
Show 50 More

[Follow us on Twitter](#) | [Visit us on Facebook](#) | [Follow us on RSS](#) | [Subscribe to Foreign Policy](#)

[About FP](#) | [Meet the Staff](#) | [Foreign Editions](#) | [Reprint Permissions](#) | [Advertising](#) | [Writers' Guidelines](#) | [Press Room](#) | [Work at FP](#)

Services: [Subscription Services](#) | [Academic Program](#) | [FP Archive](#) | [Reprint Permissions](#) | [FP Reports and Merchandise](#) | [Special Reports](#) | [Buy Back Issues](#)